

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

2 June 2016
4.30 - 5.20 pm

Present: Councillors Sarris, Blencowe (Executive Councillor), Avery, Bick and Sargeant

Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport: Councillor Blencowe

Officers:

Planning Policy Manager: Sara Saunders
Principal Planning Policy Officer: Joanna Gilbert-Wooldridge
Senior Planning Policy Officer: Bruce Waller
Sport & Recreation Manager: Ian Ross
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

Other Present:

Strategic Leisure Consultant: Rachel Fowler
Strategic Leisure Consultant: Philip Barefoot

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

16/54/DPSSC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Smart, Baigent and Gawthrope.

Councillor Sargeant attended as an alternate.

16/55/DPSSC Declarations of Interest

No declarations were made.

16/56/DPSSC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 March 2016 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

16/57/DPSSC Public Questions

There were no public questions.

16/58/DPSSC Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Playing Pitch Strategy

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report set out the work which had been undertaken with South Cambridgeshire District Council to develop the Playing Pitch Strategy 2015-2031 which addressed the needs of football, rugby, hockey, and cricket and the provision of need for both grass and artificial pitches.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

- i. Endorsed the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Playing Pitch Strategy 2015 – 2031 (Appendix B) as a material consideration I decision-making and as part of the technical evidence base for the Local Plan with immediate effect.
- ii. Agreed that any subsequent minor amendments and editing changes were made in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport, the Chair, and Spokesperson of Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Planning Policy Manager.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Questioned how schools fitted in and what the difference between secured and un-secured facilities was.
- ii. Questioned if the council could deviate from the plan, and if sports for individuals with disabilities was outside of the terms of reference.
- iii. Commented that the Council was compelled to look into majority sports.
- iv. Commented that if there was no evidence base then issues would not be able to be addressed and questioned if the Council was limited by what provision it had.

The Sports and Recreation Manager and the Senior Planning Policy Officer said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Schools in the City had community use agreements, which made them open their facilities to the public and therefore were “secured” public use. The Universities facilities were “un-secured” provision as they were not open for general public use or hire. There were some University facilities that had limited public use but this tended to be via special arrangement or new community use agreements in place at the North West University Sports facility.
- ii. The pitch strategy looked at existing facilities supporting outdoor sports and how these could evolve in the future.

Representatives from Strategic Leisure said the following in response to Members’ questions:

- i. Commented that the strategy document was a snap shot in time but there would be the opportunity to particularly look at girls and individuals with disabilities involvement in sport as the strategy was a fluid document. There was a requirement for mixed sex facilities and making existing pavilion disability friendly.
- ii. The national methodology used for the strategy meant that only the four major sports were picked up and fully assessed.
- iii. Sport England also looked at minority sports.
- iv. Rugby league was not included in the terms of reference and was not identified in the process.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

16/59/DPSSC Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Indoor Sports Facility Strategy

Matter for Decision

The Officer’s report set out the work which had been undertaken with South Cambridgeshire District Council to develop the Indoor Sports Facility Strategy 2015-2031 which addressed the future provision of indoor sports halls, swimming pools and outdoor cycling facilities to serve existing and new communities in Cambridge and South Cambridge. The strategy has assessed existing facilities, the future need for sport and active recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

- i. Endorsed the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Indoor Sports Facility Strategy 2015-2031 (Appendix C) as a material consideration in decision making and as part of the technical evidence base for the Local Plan with immediate effect.
- ii. Agreed that any minor amendments and editing changes are made in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport the Chair and Spokesperson of Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Planning Policy Manager.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Squash did not appear to feature in the documentation and commented that the City had recently lost a publicly accessible squash facility on Histon Road following a planning application.
- ii. Commented that swimmers liked different facilities not just swimming pools in leisure centres but swimming facilities which were located outside, were not heated and had no roof. Reference was made to Jesus Green swimming pool.
- iii. Commented that there was no need for a cycle track but there was an aspiration to provide one so this had been included within the strategy.
- iv. Commented that there appeared to be a balancing act between the provision of sporting facilities which the Council's evidence base did not support but where there was an aspiration from the Governing Body.

The Strategic Leisure Consultants, Sports & Recreation Manager and the Planning Policy Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Squash court provision in the City had been looked at as part of the work. Squash was not like other sports and currently there was a national decline in the popularity of the sport. Squash was popular in the 70s and 80s. There was not a lot of play and pay provision in the City,

- but centres at Kelsey Kerridge and the North West university site had public courts for hire and currently met all the local demand.
- ii. With regards to the planning application the site where the squash courts were situated was allocated within the local plan for residential development, therefore the loss of the facility was accepted by the site when it was allocated in the Local Plan.
 - iii. Commented that if proposals came forward for sporting facilities there was a whole host of factors which would be taken into account and which would be balanced against location, green belt and any special circumstances.
 - iv. Commented that Jesus Green swimming pool was not included in the modelling output as it was a seasonal facility, however ideas could be developed going forward to extend the seasons and available facilities.
 - v. There are proposals for a swimming pool at the North West University site; however whatever size was being delivered would not be enough to fulfil the unmet demand across the districts, as it was not in a location that could provide suitable access for all public demand generated from the growth across the two local authorities.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

The meeting ended at 5.20 pm

CHAIR